REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 11, and 18 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Specification

The title of the application is objected to as not being descriptive. In an effort to address the Examiner's concerns, the title has been amended. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

II. Claim Rejections

A. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claim invention.

In particular, the Office Action alleges that for claim 11, there is no description for the recitation "when the occurrence matches the particular occurrence specified in the set of rules or is within the region of interest in a picture frame specified by the set of rules..." or for the recitation "storing a set of rules specifying a particular occurrence that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory and a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to memory."

Although Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, claim 11 is amended, as indicated above, to further prosecution of this application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of claim 11. Since claims 12-17 depend from claim 11, Applicants also respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of claims 12-17.

B. <u>Provisional Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection Over Application No.
11/674,770</u>

Claims 1, 3-7, and 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-7 and 10-11 of copending Application No. 10/674,770 (hereinafter "'770 application"). This rejection will be addressed once allowable subject matter is indicated in one of these applications.

C. <u>Provisional Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection Over Application No.
10/674,840 and Basir</u>

Claims 1, 3-10, 18, and 20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6-9, 11, 15, and 18 of copending Application No. 10/674,840 (hereinafter "'840 application") in view of Unites States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154009 to Basir et al. (hereinafter "Basir"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action indicates that the claims of the '840 application filed on September 12, 2007, were considered in making this nonstatutory double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the '840 application have been amended since that time, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the current claims of the '840 application which Applicants respectfully submit are patentably distinct from the claims of the current application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

D. <u>Provisional Nonstatutory Double Patenting Rejection Over Application No.
10/674,840, Basir, and Zimmerman</u>

Claims 2 and 19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6-9, 11, 15, and 19 of the '840 application in view of Basir and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021197 to Zimmerman et al. (hereinafter "Zimmerman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action indicates that the claims of the '840 application filed on September 12, 2007, were considered in making this nonstatutory double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the '840 application have been amended since that time, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the current claims of the '840

application which Applicants respectfully submit are patentably distinct from the claims of the current application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

E. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Basir. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a method comprises receiving vehicular data describing powertrain management system information, electrical management system information, and chassis management system information; storing a set of rules specifying data that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory; when the vehicular data matches the data specified by the set of rules, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including features recited by claim 1. On the contrary, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including detecting an eccentric event; when the eccentric event is detected, continuing to record data for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Instead, Basir describes that *when the eccentric event is detected, recording is continued* for a fixed period of time, and then *once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory*. Thus, Basir describes that the detection of the eccentric event triggers further, continued recording of the data for a fixed period

of time, and only after this fixed period of time has elapsed is the data from the volatile memory copied to the non-volatile memory. In contrast, claim 1 recites that when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, the contents of the loop buffer are transferred to the memory.

The Office Action again points to paragraphs [0040-0041] of Basir for support of its alleged assertion that Basir teaches "when the vehicular data matches the data specified by the set of rules, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory" as recited by claim 1. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion that these paragraphs anticipate the recitations of claim 1. Paragraphs [0040-0041] of Basir are reproduced below:

> [0040] This data is stored directly in non-volatile storage (9) and is updated immediately after one of the events or statistics changes.
>
> [0041] The occupant of the vehicle may choose to store events permanently for later retrieval at any time by using the user-trigger (7). This trigger simulates the occurrence of
>
> an eccentric event, and therefore causes the control units (2) of the data capture and video capture modules to continue recording for a fixed period of time, and then transfer the contents of the volatile (8) memory to the non-volatile memory (9).

Paragraph [0040] of Basir is better understood in light of the preceding paragraphs [0037]-[0039] of Basir which describe that significant events and statistics pertaining to a vehicle, such as the number of times the speed of the vehicle went over 130km/h, can be stored directly in non-volatile storage and updated immediately after one of the events or statistics changes. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir describes that changes in events or statistics associated with a vehicle are stored in non-volatile memory, without teaching, suggesting, or describing transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to memory.

Paragraph [0041] of Basir describes, as discussed above, continuing to record for a fixed period of time when an eccentric event, or a trigger simulating the occurrence of an eccentric event, is detected, and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. Again, this is not analogous to the recitations of claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory.

Moreover, Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video data is tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

Basir further describes gathering vehicle and occupant data, such as occupant position data, occupant height data, and accelerations, and combining the vehicle and occupant data to provide an accurate and complete view of the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data are tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes that vehicle and occupant data can be gathered and combined to indicate the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events, without teaching, suggesting, or describing that the vehicle and occupant data are metadata describing a rule of a set of rules that caused contents of a loop buffer to be transferred to memory or that the vehicle and occupant data described by Basir are used to tag time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data.

11

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claims 6, 8, and 10 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 8, and 10 are also allowable over Basir. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

F. Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Krishnamurthy

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent No. 6,496,607 to Krishnamurthy et al. (hereinafter "Krishnamurthy"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, that a method comprises specifying i) multiple regions of interest within a single picture frame and ii) multiple regions of disinterest within the single picture frame; receiving vehicular data describing powertrain management system information, electrical management system information, and chassis management system information; storing a set of rules specifying data that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory; when the vehicular data matches the data specified in the set of rules, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents of the loop buffer transferred at a first bitrate associated with the multiple regions of interest if the vehicular data is associated the multiple regions of interest and the contents of the loop buffer transferred at a second bitrate associated with the multiple regions of disinterest if the vehicular data is associated with the multiple regions of disinterest, the contents of the loop buffer providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including the features recited in claim 18. In contrast, as discussed above, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including detecting an eccentric event; when the eccentric event is detected, continuing to record for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or

12

describe that when vehicular data matches data specified in a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory. Instead, Basir describes that *when the eccentric event is recorded, recording is continued for a fixed period of time* and *then once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory.*

Basir also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video data is tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

Basir further describes gathering vehicle and occupant data, such as occupant position data, occupant height data, and accelarations, and combining the vehicle and occupant data to provide an accurate and complete view of the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data are tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes that vehicle and occupant data can be gathered and combined to indicate the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events, without teaching, suggesting, or describing that the vehicle and occupant data are metadata describing a rule of a set of rules that caused contents of a loop buffer to be transferred to memory or that the vehicle and occupant data described by Basir are used to tag time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data.

Moreover, Basir completely fails to teach, suggest, or describe specifying multiple regions of interest within a single picture frame and multiple regions of disinterest within the single picture frame and transferring the contents of a loop buffer at a first bitrate associated with the multiple regions of interest if the vehicular data is associated with the multiple regions of interest and transferring the contents of a loop buffer at a second bitrate associated with the

multiple regions of disinterest if the vehicular data is associated with the multiple regions of disinterest

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Krishnamurthy allegedly to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Basir. However, like Basir, Krishnamurthy does not teach, suggest, or describe the features recited by claim 18. On the contrary, Krishnamurthy describes a method for classifying regions of an image, based on the relative importance of various areas, and using the importance information to allocate resources so that the important regions of the image are enhanced. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when the vehicular data matches the data specified in the set of rules, where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Moreover, Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 18 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claim 20 depends from claim 18 and recites further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is also allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

G. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Brodsky

The Office Action notes that "[c]laims 11, 13, 15, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by" Basir in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058341 to Brodsky et al. (hereinafter "Brodsky"). Applicants respectfully assert that since the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky are used to reject claims 11, 13, 15, 16, and 17, Applicants presume that the Examiner actually meant that claims 11, 13, 15, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir and Brodsky. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, that a method comprises storing a set of rules specifying a particular occurrence that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory; receiving information regarding an occurrence; when the occurrence matches the

14

particular occurrence specified in the set of rules, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents of the loop buffer providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including features recited by claim 11. On the contrary, as discussed above, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including detecting an eccentric event; when the eccentric event is detected, continuing to record data for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Instead, Basir describes that *when the eccentric event is detected, recording is continued* for a fixed period of time, and then *once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory.* Thus, Basir describes that the detection of the eccentric event triggers further, continued recording of the data for a fixed period of time, and only after this fixed period of time has elapsed is the data from the volatile memory copied to the non-volatile memory. In contrast, claim 11 recites that when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules, the contents of the loop buffer are transferred to the memory.

Moreover, Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video

data is tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

Basir further describes gathering vehicle and occupant data, such as occupant position data, occupant height data, and accelarations, and combining the vehicle and occupant data to provide an accurate and complete view of the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data are tagged with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes that vehicle and occupant data can be gathered and combined to indicate the conditions prior to, during, and post eccentric events, without teaching, suggesting, or describing that the vehicle and occupant data are metadata describing a rule of a set of rules that caused contents of a loop buffer to be transferred to memory or that the vehicle and occupant data described by Basir are used to tag time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Brodsky allegedly to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Basir. However, like Basir, Brodsky does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including the features recited by claim 11. In contrast Brodsky describes a method for detecting the occurrence of a specific event including capturing image data of a scene; detecting and tracking an object of interest in the data image; analyzing features of the object of interest; comparing the analyzed features with predetermined criteria indicative of a specific event; determining whether a specific event has occurred based on the comparison; and if the specific event has occurred, then outputting a result of the detection to, for instance, a central monitoring station.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Brodsky fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Instead, Brodsky describes that when a specific event is determined

16

to have occurred, then outputting the result of the detection to a central monitoring station, without teaching, suggesting, or describing that when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules, then transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory.

Moreover, Brodsky fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused contents of a loop buffer to be transferred to memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. Since claims 13, 15, 16, and 17 depend from claim 11 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 15, 16, and 17 are also allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

H. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Official Notice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-5 are also allowable over claim 1.

The Official Notice taken by the Examiner for a mass-storage device, an optical storage device, and a flash memory storage device fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that the recitations of claim 1 are not well-known or common knowledge in the art.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Maeda

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent No. 6,763,071 to Maeda et al. (hereinafter "Maeda"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 9 depends from Basir and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is also allowable over Basir. In addition, Maeda fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Maeda describes a method for protecting intellectual property rights of an image including entering image data encoded with plural modes and security data for protecting the image data; determining, based on the security data, whether reproduction of the encoded image data is permitted; and decoding the encoded image data based on the results of the determination. Like Basir, Maeda fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data. Moreover, Maeda also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 9 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Maeda. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

J. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Fiore

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191952 to Fiore et al. (hereinafter "Fiore"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 7 depends from claim 1 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is also allowable over Basir. In addition, Fiore fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Fiore describes a method for receiving and temporarily storing input signal data including receiving an event signal; extracting the signal data from a circular storage buffer, and storing the data into a file system. However, like Basir, Fiore fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 7 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Fiore. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

K. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Zimmerman

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021197 to Zimmerman et al. (hereinafter "Zimmerman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 2 is also allowable over Basir. Further, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless communication to communicate the vehicular data. However, like Basir, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of a loop buffer to memory when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data. Moreover, Zimmerman also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 2 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Zimmerman. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

L. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Zimmerman

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Zimmerman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 18 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claim 19 depends from claim 18 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 19 is also allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In addition, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teachings of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In particular, as discussed above, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless communication to communicate the vehicular data. However, like Basir and Krishnamurthy, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of a

loop buffer to a memory when vehicular data matches data specified by a set of rules, where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Moreover, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 19 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Zimmerman. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

M. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir, Brodsky, and Zimmerman

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Brodsky and further in view of Zimmerman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. Since claim 14 depends from claim 11 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 14 is also allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. In addition, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. In particular, as discussed above, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless communication to communication the vehicular data. However, like Basir and Brodsky, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Zimmerman also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 14 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir, Brodsky, and Zimmerman. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

N. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir, Brodsky, and Maeda

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Brodsky and further in view of Maeda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. Since claim 12 depends from claim 11 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is also allowable over the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky. In addition, Maeda fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teachings of Basir and Brodsky.   In particular, as discussed above, Maeda describes a method for protecting intellectual property rights of an image including entering image data encoded with plural modes and security data for protecting the image data; determining, based on the security data, whether reproduction of the encoded image data is permitted; and decoding the encoded image data based on the results of the determination. However, like Basir and Krishnamurthy, Maeda fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Maeda also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule of the set of rules that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over the combined teachings of Basir, Brodsky, and Maeda. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: July 15, 2008

/Jodi L. Hartman/
Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, N.W.
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900

53377
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE